DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 273 027 EA 018 761

TITLE	More Effective Schools/Teaching Project: Second Overview.
INSTITUTION	Spencerport Central Schools, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Jul 84
NOTE	7p.; In its: Spencerport Central Schools More Effective Schools/Teaching Project Documents; see EA 018 758.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Definitions; Elementary Secondary Education; Minimum Competencies; *Program Design; *Program Development; *Program Implementation; *Review (Reexamination); *School Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS	New York (Spencerport)

ABSTRACT

This document presents an overview of the design and implementation stages of the Spencerport (New York) More Effective Schools/Teaching Project. The first section lists nine reasons for the uniqueness of the Spencerport project, including district size, its racial and economic components, participant satisfaction, a set of clearly defined goals, and a master plan that sets forth 15 assumptions on which effective schools/teaching rest. The second section chronologically outlines the implementation stages of the project. These stages are: (1) awareness, (2) inservice, (3) project design, (4) turnkey and needs assessment, (5) implementation (within individual school buildings), (6) evaluation, and (7) future. The third section lists three unique products of the project that may be ordered by using an appended order form. These documents are: (1) "Master Plan," June 1983; (2) "Conducting an Effective Schools Project," May 1984; and (3) "Overview of the More Effective Schools/Teaching Project," December 1983. (IW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED273027

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert E. Sudlow
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Spencerport Central Schools

Spencerport, New York 14559

MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS/TEACHING PROJECT

Second Overview, July 1984

The Spencerport Project is unique for several reasons.

1. It is being conducted in a small (3,351 K-12 students) suburban school district. Parts of the district are semi-rural in nature.

2. It is a middle class school district with approximately ninety-seven percent of the students Caucasian.

3. All schools in the district are involved; namely, three elementary schools, a junior high school and a senior high school.

4. There is a strong district office commitment to helping the project be successful in each building.

5. a. Student achievement is good. Median scores on the Stanford Achievement Test ran in the sixtieth percentile. Similar scores are attained on other standardized tests.

   b. Parent satisfaction with the educational program is high.

   c. The main reason for embarking on this project is to see if significant research conducted in inner city schools could be used to further improve the quality of education in Spencerport.

6. Spencerport is a low-wealth school district. Of the eighteen school districts in Monroe County (Rochester, New York area), it ranks seventeenth or eighteenth in per pupil expenditures. Yet the More Effective Schools/Teaching Project has no outside federal aid, special state aid or foundation support. It is funded totally by the local budget.

EA 018 761

7. The Project has a stringent academic achievement goal. It is:

   The instructional program in each building shall be effective. Effective is defined as the combination of all of the following:

   a. Ninety-five, or greater, percent of all students at each grade level shall demonstrate minimum academic mastery. Children in Learning Disabilities classes shall be included in building analyses. The effect of the inclusion of the children on the total population shall be carefully monitored and analyzed.

   b. There shall be no significant difference in the proportion of youth demonstrating minimum academic mastery as a function of socio-economic class.

   c. The above two conditions shall have been obtained for a minimum of three consecutive years.

   Should a school building not be effective according to the criteria of a Primary Goal, then we recommend that the following definition of school improvement be used until the building attains effectiveness.

   a. There shall be an annual increase in the proportion of students who demonstrate minimum academic mastery,

      and

   b. There shall be an annual decrease in the proportion of youth demonstrating minimum academic mastery as a function of socio-economic class.

8. In addition to concentrating on students with educational achievement, the Project has a Concomitant Goal for those who do well. It is:

   a. There shall be an annual evaluation of the percentage of students demonstrating superior academic mastery as demonstrated either by scoring in stanines seven, eight and nine on the Stanford Achivement Test or by scoring at or above 90% on a Regents exam.

8. b. For those subjects in which a significant percentage of the students take a Regents exam:

    1. An annual increase in the percentage of students scoring 65% or better.

    2. An annual increase in the percentage of students taking the exam.

9. The Master Plan for the Project sets forth fifteen assumptions on which effective schools/teaching rest. These statements were approved by an unanimous vote of the Leadership Planning Team.

This project was, and is being, implemented in the following manner:

Awareness Stage

1. During the 1982-83 school year, an awareness session was held with each building, the Administrative Council, and the Board of Education using the ASCD videotape on Teacher and School Effectiveness. These sessions were conducted either by the Assistant Superintendent for Instruction or the Superintendent of Schools.

2. Half-day sessions orienting people to the research and its implications were held with the following groups:

    Board of Education
    Administrative Council
    Curriculum Council
    Teacher Union Executive Committee

Inservice Stage

In-depth reviews of the research and its implications were provided to the following:

-Principals and Assistant Principals -- 1½ days

-Leadership Planning Team -- 2 days
(This is a district-wide steering committee composed of key teachers and principals.)

These sessions were led by Mr. Edmonds and Dr. Lezotte.

Project Design Stage

The Leadership Planning Team developed a district-wide plan of action which was submitted to the Superintendent of Schools and then to the Board of Education for approval. -- 4 days

Mr. Edmonds and Dr.Lezotte assisted the team.

Turnkey and Needs Assessment Stages

1. Building Planning Teams were formed. They consisted of the teachers who were on the district Leadership Planning Team plus others from the building and the principal.

2. In May 1983 all staff members completed the Connecticut School Interview. With the help of Dr. Lezotte and Mr. Edmonds we developed a secondary version of this instrument.

3. During the summer, Mr. Edmonds and Dr. Lezotte analyzed the data and prepared summary reports.

4. Disaggregated analyses of student achievement in each building were developed based upon the May 1983 Stanford Achievement Tests.

5. During the late summer Building Planning Teams, using the results of the needs assessment and the school profile prepared by Mr. Edmonds and Dr. Lezotte and the disaggregated analysis of student achievement, developed proposed action plans. They then submitted these plans to their faculty for review, dialogue, and consensus before submitting them to the Superintendent of Schools for approval.

Implementation Stage

During the 1983-84 school year Building Planning Teams and their faculties worked to implement their plan.

An immediate benefit of the project is that the total K-12 faculty is discussing significant issues identified through research. For example, several buildings are trying to determine whether they have a clear sense of mission. Another building is upset over the finding that they may not have high expectations for all students. Primary teachers proposed that the report card be changed to better reflect the research.

Evaluation Stage

1. In May and June of 1984 the Connecticut School Interview was readministered in each building.

2. Updated disaggregated analyses of student achievement were developed using the results of the May 1984 administration of the Stanford Achievement Tests.

3. In July 1984 a workshop was held for Building Planning Teams to teach them how to evaluate the

Evaluation Stage (continued)

data and to use it to build an action plan for 1984-85.

This workshop was led by Dr. Lezotte and Dr. Patrick Proctor.

Future Stages

1. Implementation - to occur in 1984-85.

2. Evaluation - to occur in May to July 1985.

Unique Products of the Project

The following documents have been developed which may be of interest to others.

1. Master Plan, June 1983.

   Project goals, concomitant goals, assumptions and detailed procedures are set forth.

2. Conducting an Effective Schools Project, May 1984.

   This paper sets forth the unique characteristics which identify an effective schools project, operationally defines an effective school and explains how to develop a disaggregated analysis of student achievement.

3. Overview of the More Effective Schools/Teaching Project, December 1983.

   Designed to be read in conjunction with Edmonds article "Educating the Urban Poor," this overview presents his definition of school effectiveness in a different manner and defines the correlates of an effective school.

Copies of these documents can be obtained by completing the attached form.

If you find these documents or the ideas in them useful, permission to either reproduce them or to use them in your documents is granted. We would appreciate it, however, if appropriate credit would be given to the Spencerport Central Schools.

© 1984

Dr. Robert E. Sudlow
Assistant Superintendent for Instruction
Spencerport Central Schools
71 Lyell Avenue
Spencerport, New York 14559

Please send me one copy of each of the items checked below.

_____ Master Plan, June 1983

_____ Conducting An Effective Schools Project, May 1984

_____ Overview of the More Effective Schools/Teaching Project, December 1983

_____
Name

_____
Title

_____
Institution

_____
Street Address

_____
City, State, Zip Code

_____
Telephone No. (include area code)